



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Koichi IKESHIMA

Serial No.: 09/803,941

Group Art Unit: 1774

Filed: March 13, 2001

Examiner: Tamra L. Dicus

For: CERAMIC HONEYCOMB STRUCTURE

COMMUNICATION UNDER 37 CFR 1.133(b)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

PLEASE ACCEPT THIS AS
AUTHORIZATION TO DEBIT
OR CREDIT FEES TO
DEP. ACCT. 16-0331
PARKHURST & WENDEL

Sir:

Further to the interview held March 10, 2004, the following remarks are provided directed to the substance of the interview; 37 CFR 1.133(b).

At the interview the Amendment filed December 31, 2003, was stated to provide extensive remarks on the most recent amendments to the claims.

Machida et al. '446 and Kumazawa et al. '899 are each cited alone against various claims. Those references and data in the Declaration showing that neither of the references have thermal

expansion coefficients larger at the circumferential wall portion than at the inside partition wall portion as stated in the claims were extensively discussed. The exact nature of each of the showings appears in the Amendment filed December 31, 2003. At the end of the interview, the Examiners indicated that the rejections based on these two references will be dropped; see the Examiner's Interview Summary.

Kotani et al. '067 has been cited only as a secondary reference against dependent claims 4-5 and 7 (Machida et al. '446 in view of Kotani et al. '067; see Section 9 of the Final Rejection mailed October 10, 2003) and against dependent claims 3-5 (Machida et al. '446 in view of Kotani et al. '067 and further in view of Beauseigneur et al.). Both of these rejections use Machida et al. '446 as the primary reference. In view of the statement in the Interview Summary that Machida et al. '446 is being dropped, it is submitted these rejections relying on Kotani et al. '067 et al. as a secondary reference are now moot.

The deficiencies of Kotani et al. '067 were discussed at the interview; the Examiners' attentions were directed to the conclusions of the declarant in the Declaration with respect to Kotani et al. '067 et al. The declarant stated there was no room for giving substantial stress to the inner portion after the

coating after the outer coating was applied because the inner portion had been fired and became hard before the outer circumferential wall portion was coated.

The Interview Summary states "the office will reconsider the Declaration to Kotani." However, as noted above, Kotani et al. '067 has only been used in the rejections of dependent claims as a secondary reference; the primary reference is Machida et al. '446. In view of the dropping of Machida et al. '446, there is no proper rejection of the claims on the basis of Kotani et al. '067 et al. alone.

Finally, as to the enablement rejection, Kotani et al. '067 is cited for the disclosure in col. 8, lines 20-30, where there appears various ways to apply a coating to the outer periphery of a honeycomb structure. These coating methods are art recognized; thus, those skilled in the art are properly enabled by the instant application and what is known in the art to make the ceramic honeycomb structure.

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by applicant would be desirable for placing this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

March 6, 2004
Date


Charles A. Wendel
Registration No. 24,453

CAW/EC/ch

Attorney Docket No.: WATK:210

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.
1421 Prince Street, Suite 210
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805
Telephone: (703) 739-0220